The Continuing Inquiry

VOLUME 2 NUMBER 4 NOVEMBER 22, 1977

IS THE FBI SHIELDING A JFK ASSASSIN?

By J. Gary Shaw & Larry R. Harris

Who is the mysterious French soldier who was in Fort Worth and Dallas on November 22, 1963, and who was expelled from the United States 18 hours after President Kennedy was assassinated? And why was information about the mystery man withheld from the Warren Commission?

Information regarding this strange episode came to light last year with the release of several thousand pages of declassified CIA documents; they were obtained by a Freedom of Information Act lawsuit filed by Washington attorney Bernard Fensterwald and the Committee to Investigate Assassinations. These were forwarded to a Dallas researcher.

While a wealth of important information is to be found among the documents, Dallas-area investigators found Document #632-796 of particular interest. This nearly illegible report, dated April 1, 1964, relates that one Jean Souetre (pronounced John Swetra) aka Michal Roux aka Michal Hertz, had been in Fort Worth on the morning of November 22, and in Dallas that afternoon. Souetre, according to the report, was expelled from this country 18 hours after the assassination. It goes on to state that he "is believed to be identical with a Captain who is a deserter from the French Army and is active in the OAS." The document advises that the French legal attache in Paris had questioned the Federal Bureau of Investigation in New York City in March, 1964, wanting to know the reason for Souetre's expulsion from the U.S., and his destination; French authorities were concerned because of President Charles DeGaulle's pending visit to Mexico. The report notes that the Bureau's files regarding Souetre were negative, and that the FBI wanted CIA to check its files.

JEAN SOUETRE IN 1954

The document mentions in passing that in January, 1964, Souetre received mail from a Houston dentist. Last month, Gary Shaw located and interviewed this man. He said that he met Souetre in 1954 when he was a U.S. Security Officer stationed in France and Souetre was a career military officer in the French Air Force. He described Souetre as "very well educated, very outgoing, forward, dynamic" and as "a very prominent upcoming French Security Officer" at the time he knew him. Subsequently, at an unknown time, Souetre apparently forfeited a promising military career by joining the Secret Army Organization (OAS)-- the French underground movement opposing DeGaulle's policy toward French control in Algiers.* (The dentist mentioned that he had worked "with" the CIA in France).

The doctor said that many years passed with no contact between he and Souetre. Then, very shortly after the JFK assassination, he realized that he was being "tailed" by unknown persons. He was under surveillance, it turned out, by FBI agents who questioned him about his one-time French companion.

The doctor says "they were trying to find Jean under any circumstances, under any conditions..... they felt that Jean knew who, or he himself, had assassinated Kennedy. And what they wanted to know was who in Washington had had him flown out of Dallas. And to my knowledge, nobody ever found out or nobody ever knew." The doctor doesn't have "the vaguest idea" why Souetre was in Dallas on November 22, but the FBI agents suggested that he was enroute to visit him. The dentist, though, says the Bureau interviewed him apparently because of a four or five year-old Christmas card he had mailed to Souetre and which ended up in the postal system's dead letter files. According to the doctor, the FBI located the card within 24 hours of Kennedy's death. (It should be noted, however, that the CIA document states, "In January (1964) he (Souetre) received mail from a dentist....").

Among the questions arising from Document #632-796, then, are these:

(1) Was Jean Souetre involved in the Kennedy assassination?
(2) Who in Washington thought it necessary to secret Souetre out of this country within 18 hours of the assassination?
(3) Why did the FBI lie to the CIA about its file on Souetre? (according to the dentist, he was interviewed by FBI agent Frank Rooks very shortly after the assassination-- well before the April 1, 1964 date on the CIA document, when the Bureau said its files were negative regarding Souetre?
(4) Why did the FBI deem it necessary to withhold from the Warren Commission, information about a member of an active terrorist organization who was in Fort Worth at the same time JFK was, and probably in Dallas when Kennedy drove through Dealey Plaza?

These are questions which should be asked and for which answers should be sought, by anyone working on the JFK assassination-- independently or officially..

---

* This brings to mind the tale of an OAS operative who claims he was recruited to kill President Kennedy in 1961. Jose Luis Romero, a soldier in the French Army who revolted and helped form the OAS, related his story to French journalist Camille Gilles in 1972. According to Romero, he became friends in 1958 with a counselor at the American consulate in Algiers; the latter worked for an unnamed secret agency of the U.S. and, like Romero, was violently anti-DeGaulle and anti-communist. In May, 1961, this man introduced Romero to two Americans who proposed a contract to kill the American President when he visited Paris later that month. Romero says he was to be given $400,000 for shooting JFK while pretending to aim at DeGaulle. But, Romero said, on the day of the planned attempt he began to have second thoughts-- realizing the "accidental" murder would be blamed on the OAS, and fearing for his own life. Following the advice of his commanding officers in OAS, Romero said he evaded the two Americans and fled the country with half the $400,000. He fought with mercenaries in the Congo for awhile, then made his way to South America, where he made a fortune raising livestock. While all this may seem reminiscent of Appointment in Dallas, the possible connection between the OAS and assassination plots is thought-provoking.

* * * * * * * * * * * *

SORRY-- NO INDEX UNTIL NEXT MONTH.

THE CONTINUING INQUIRY
July 22, 1977
Published monthly by
THE MIDLOTHIAN MIRROR, INC.
Volume I Number 12
Subscription price $24.00
($12.00 for students)
Published in Midlothian, Texas 76065
Second class permit pending

EDITOR: Penn Jones

I know that my retirement will make no difference in its cardinal principles, that it will always fight for progress and reform, never tolerate injustice or corruption. Always fight demagogues of all parties. Never belong to any party. Always oppose privileged classes and public plunderers. Never lack sympathy with the poor. Always remain devoted to the public welfare. Never be satisfied with merely printing news. Always be drastically independent. Never be afraid to attack wrong, whether by predatory plutocracy or predatory poverty.

April 10, 1907 Joseph Pulitzer

MORE ON TOM BETHELL: A DISSENTING VIEW FROM SYLVIA MEAGHER

Dear Penn,
This letter is for your information and/or publication. If you do publish it, however, please print it in full, word for word.
Kind regards,
Sylvia

EDITOR'S NOTE

As soon as we learned of Syliva Meagher's part in the Tom Bethell story, we asked her for this article. We must say that we totally disagree with her reasoning and conclusions. We do respect her excellent book ACCESSORIES AFTER THE FACT.

In addition to the murder of four persons who would have been Garrison witnesses against Clay Shaw, Garrison had more than one traitor on his staff. That, in my opinion was the real reason Garrison was unable to convict Clay Shaw.

26 October 1977

Dear Penn,

This will reply to your letter of 21 October 1977 in which you say: "I didn't know until recently that you convinced Tom Bethell to give Jim's plans to Shaw attorneys. If you care to I would love to have the story for The Continuing Inquiry."

I have always felt proud that I was among the first of the critics to realize that Garrison was a dangerous charlatan and that I denounced him publicly at every possible opportunity. I have also felt proud that I played some small part in preventing the kind of injustice to Clay Shaw that was suffered by Lee Harvey Oswald--the stigma of "assassi." placed upon an innocent man.

My opposition to Garrison, which only a few of my fellow-critics have acknowledged in retrospect was wholly justified, was based on exactly the same considerations that caused me to denounce the Warren Commission. That is, the systematic framing of an innocent man by a powerful authority on the basis of feeble evidence, inventions, distortions, and perjurious testimony. I gave as much credence to Perry Raymond Russo as I gave to Helen Markham, as much credence to Vernon Bundy as to Charles Givens, and as much credence to Charles Speisel as to Marina Oswald. On the strength of preposterous testimony from such witnesses, Garrison like the Warren Commission implicated Oswald in the assassination of JFK--a crime of which I have always considered Oswald to be totally innocent--as he also tried to implicate Clay Shaw.

Naturally I saw it as my duty to do everything in my power to prevent another flagrant miscarriage of justice. My vocal repudiation of Garrison caused me the loss of several valued friendships with other critics, who persisted in justifying in Garrison the very same kind of outrages that had animated their attacks on the Warren Commission. Indeed, while no one had ever tried to silence my criticism of the Warren Commission, I now found to my shock and horror that my fellow-critics tried to silence my criticism of Garrison. They did not succeed.

Quite a few years have passed since the shameful and mortifying trial of Clay Shaw. My recollection is no longer vivid. But I do remember that Tom Bethell was convinced that Shaw was being ruthlessly and cynically framed and that the detailed evidence he needed in order to build his defence was being wrongfully withheld from his attorneys. I had every sympathy with Bethell's moral dilemma and crisis of conscience and I strongly encouraged him to give to Shaw's attorneys the information to which they were clearly entitled but which Garrison was denying them. I am deeply gratified that Bethell's action led to the exposure of Charles Speisel as a plain lunatic--a "witness" clearly paranoic, deranged, and hallucinating. The very fact that Garrison attempted to use such a witness vindicates all my charges against him.

Therefore, I have no apology whatsoever for having influenced Bethell to reveal to Shaw's attorneys the information to which they were morally and legally entitled.

Garrison did enormous harm not alone to Clay Shaw and others but to the credibility and standing of all the critics of the Warren Report. It was Garrison's contemptible antics that put the whole case into cold storage for many years. That some critics still believe and defend him simply astounds me.

I would like to end this letter by quoting what I wrote many years ago to the editors of a magazine, in addressing myself to Garrison and the Warren Commission. I said in that letter, "One is not obliged to take sides in a gang war in which both sides have only contempt for truth." I take great satisfaction in the fact that I repudiated and denounced both the Warren Commission and Garrison. I only wish that all my fellow-critics had done the same and thereby testified to their integrity and their unfaltering commitment to truth and justice.

Yours sincerely,

Sylvia Meagher

* * * * * * * * * * * *

STRANGE DEATH NO. 136

William C. Sullivan, 65, former No. 3 man in the FBI, was shot to death while hunting deer near his home in New Hampshire on November 9, 1977.

Sullivan was in an open field and, just before sunrise, was shot by a young man in his twenties who was standing 243 feet from Sullivan-- whom the man purportedly mistook for a deer. The weapon used was a 30.06 automatic rifle equipped with a telescopic sight. The young man was charged with a misdemeanor homicide. He was released to the custody of his father, who is a New Hampshire State Trooper.

In his later years, Sullivan had become critical of J. Edgar Hoover. His death must be considered, in view of the coming release of 80,000 pages of FBI documents related to the assassination of President John F. Kennedy. As usual, these documents will be heavily "sanitized". Sullivan, who headed the Bureau's JFK assassination investigation, was the one man who might have filled in some of the blanks....

Thursday, Nov. 10, 1977 **THE WASHINGTON POST**

By J. Y. Smith
Washington Post Staff Writer

William C. Sullivan, once the third-ranking official of the FBI and then an outspoken critic of the late J. Edgar Hoover and his policies, was killed in a hunting accident yesterday near his home in Sugar Hill, N.H. He was 65.

Police said Mr. Sullivan was shot while deer hunting in the White Mountains. They identified the other hunter as Robert Daniels, about 20, of Lisbon, N.H. The incident was still under investigation last night and no charges had been filed against Daniels.

William Clarence Sullivan, a farm boy from Bolton, Mass., entered the FBI as a special agent on Aug. 4, 1941. By the time the late J. Edgar Hoover had forced him to retire on Oct. 6, 1971, Mr. Sullivan was the assistant to the director for all the bureau's investigative activities.

His 30 years of service saw enormous changes in the FBI, its place in American government, and how it was regarded by some other parts of the government—notably Congress—and by some portions of the American public.

When Mr. Sullivan joined the bureau, the FBI saw itself—and was seen by others—as a crime-fighting organization and as the country's first line of defense against Nazis and other subversives. By the time he left, the bureau was coming under increasing attack for violating the rights of American citizens. Many of these charges have since been substantiated and the myth of Hoover himself has been dispelled.

Mr. Sullivan played a role in these transformations, first as a loyal lieutenant of Hoover who initiated many of the abuses that have been uncovered by Congress and the press in recent years, and then as a bitter critic of his late boss.

In an interview with The Los Angeles Times in 1973, Mr. Sullivan called Hoover "a master blackmailer." He suggested that the director had lost control of himself and was verging on senility before his death. A year later, Mr. Sullivan submitted a paper to a meeting of the Roscoe Pound-American Trial Lawyers Foundation in which he said that the FBI, as then organized, posed a threat to the civil liberties of the country.

"The weaknesses of the FBI have always been the leadership in Washington, of which I was a part for 15 years," he wrote. "I accept my share of the blame for its serious shortcomings."

For 10 of the 15 years during which Mr. Sullivan described himself as a member of the top leadership of the FBI, he was an assistant director in charge of domestic intelligence operations.

In this capacity, he played a role in numerous abuses by the FBI that have been documented by the Senate Intelligence Committee headed by Sen. Frank Church (D-Idaho). These include "black bag" operations, or burglaries carried out by FBI agents; "Cointelpro," the counterintelligence program against such groups as the Ku Klux Klan, the Black Panthers and other black groups, antiwar groups during the Vietnam era, and the "New Left"; the tapping of the telephones of 17 members or former members of the National Security Council staff and of reporters, which were illegal taps designed by the Nixon White House to plug news leaks, and a broad range of other activities aimed at "dissident" groups within the United States.

The final report of the Church Committee quotes the following passage from Mr. Sullivan's testimony:

"Never once did I hear anybody, including myself, raise the question, 'Is this course of action which we have agreed upon lawful, is it legal, is it ethical or moral?' We never gave any thought to this line of reasoning, because we were just naturally pragmatic."

For his part in this "pragmatism," Mr. Sullivan was investigated extensively by the Watergate special prosecutor's office. The question was this: had Mr. Sullivan conspired to remove from FBI files the so-called "Kissinger" wiretaps on the 17 National Security Council aides and reporters for the purpose of concealing these taps from U.S. District Judge W. Matt Byrne?

Judge Byrne was presiding over the trial of Daniel Ellsburg, who released the famous "Pentagon papers" to the press in 1970. When it was learned that Ellsburg had been overheard on one of these taps, Judge Byrne dismissed the charges against him.

In fact, Mr. Sullivan had removed these files from the FBI just before he went into retirement, and turned them over to Robert C. Mardian, a former assistant attorney general in charge of internal security. The files ended up in the Nixon White House.

Mr. Sullivan said later that he had taken the files because he feared that Hoover would try to use them to "blackmail" President Nixon into keeping Hoover in his job indefinitely.

On Sept. 16, 1975, the Watergate special prosecutor's office wrote to Mr. Sullivan's attorney that "the special prosecutor has examined the evidence (of alleged conspiracy) against Mr. Sullivan and has concluded that the evidence does not warrant the bringing of any criminal charges against Mr. Sullivan."

Since his forced retirement in 1971, Mr. Sullivan repeatedly has stated the view that the top FBI officials—not the field agents—should be held responsible for violations of the law committed in the name of the bureau.

Last summer, he testified before a

federal grand jury in New York that has brought charges against John J. Kearney, a retired supervisor of the FBI's New York field office. Kearney was indicted last April on charges that he helped direct mail-opening and wiretapping operations. The case has not yet gone to trial.

Mr. Sullivan acquired a reputation through his career in the FBI as an intellectual and an expert on communism. His views on the Comunist Party of the U.S.A. led to his break with Hoover. In 1970, Mr. Sullivan told a meeting of United Press International editors that "radical organizations," such as the Weathermen faction of the Students for a Democratic Society, presented a greater threat to the country than the Communists.

Hoover reportedly remonstrated with Mr. Sullivan on the ground that the FBI's budget was based on the alleged threat of communism, and that Mr. Sullivan's remarks undercut this position. Mr. Sullivan declined to retract his statements and told him that Hoover himself knew them to be true.

After leaving the FBI, Mr. Sullivan worked briefly in private industry and then returned to the Justice Department to work on a drug enforcement project. In recent years he had lived in retirement in New Hampshire, although he was still a party to various civil suits growing out of FBI abuses at the time of his death.

Survivors include his wife, Marion, and two sons, Andrew and William, all of the home in Sugar Hill, and a daughter, Mrs. Mark D. Tuttle, of Simsbury, Conn.

Ex-agent 6th to die in six-month span

By JIM MARRS
Star-Telegram Writer

William C. Sullivan, formerly No. 3 man in the FBI, has become the sixth bureau official to die within the past six months.

All were connected with the investigation of the John F. Kennedy assassination.

Sullivan, 65, was fatally shot near his New Hampshire home Wednesday when, according to state officials, he was mistaken for a deer by a young hunter.

The veteran FBI official was in charge of the bureau's counter-espionage section in 1963.

In "The Invisible Government," a book by David Wise and Thomas B. Ross, the authors said "actual counter-espionage work is conducted by the FBI's hush-hush division Number Five. This is the Domestic Intelligence Division, headed by William C. Sullivan. It is in charge of espionage, sabotage and subversion cases."

• • •

SOME PUBLICATIONS went further, charging that Division Five's work included assassinations.

Other FBI officials who have died since the House Committee on Assassinations was formed last year to re-open investigation of the killings of John F. Kennedy, Robert Kennedy and Martin Luther King include:

• Louis Nichols, 71, also described by the Washington Post as a former No. 3 man under former FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover. Nichols, who was a bureau official during the JFK investigation, was said to have died of a heart attack in June 1977.

• Alan H. Belmont, 70, a former assistant to Hoover and a Warren Commission witness, died in early August 1977. The Washington Post cited only a "long illness" as the cause of his death.

• James C. Cadigan, 60, a document expert who testified before the Warren Commission, died in August 1977 after suffering a fall at his home, the Washington Post said.

• Donald W. Kaylor, 50, a former chemist in the FBI's fingerprint section, died late last month. The Washington Post cited a heart attack as the cause of death.

• J.M. English, who headed the FBI Forensic Sciences Laboratory after his retirement as an agent in 1966, also died late last month of a heart attack, the Washington Post reported.

• • •

HOOVER, THE legendary head of the FBI, was the victim of a heart attack May 1, 1972, District of Columbia coroner Dr. James L. Luke said.

After examining Hoover's body, Luke said the cause of death might have been a heart attack. He added that an autopsy was not indicated.

Clyde Tolson, Hoover's life-long companion and housemate, died in 1975.

Sullivan's part in the Kennedy assassination investigation began quite early.

On Dec. 4, 1963, 12 days after Kennedy's death, Sullivan dispatched an FBI memo indicating that there was no evidence that Lee Harvey Oswald was inspired or directed by pro-Castro organizations or by any foreign country.

The memo was circulated five days before the FBI's five-volume report on the assassination was complete and almost a year before the Warren Commission published its report.

Many documents in the commission's 26 volumes have come under question in recent yeas.

• • •

IN 1976, THE Senate Intelligence Committee headed by Sen. Frank Chruch said in its report that Sullivan was one of three FBI aides told by Hoover that the director opposed President Lyndon Johnson's plan to create the Warren Commission.

The committee's report on the Kennedy assassination quoted Hoover as saying, "The thing I am most concerned about . . . is having something issued so we can convince the public that (Lee Harvey) Oswald is the real assassin." Oswald was accused of assassinating John F. Kennedy.

Sullivan, in the years after the assassination, apparently became disenchanted with Hoover and some FBI policy.

His feud with Hoover climaxed in 1971 when he arrived at his office to find that Hoover had ordered the locks on his door changed.

Testifying before Church's committee, Sullivan said Hoover had leaked the secret FBI assassination report about 10 days after Kennedy's death to "blunt the drive for an independent investigation of the assassination."

• • •

SULLIVAN ALSO spoke out against his former employer during the investigation into a note left by Oswald at the Dallas FBI office prior to the assassination.

Agent James Hosty, for whom the note was intended, told a House subcommittee he destroyed Oswald's note after Kennedy's death upon orders from his superiors. He also said he did not tell the Warren Commission about the note, also on orders from superiors.

Sullivan backed up Hosty's statements when he told Time magazine that at least 10 top FBI officials in Washington knew of the Oswald note.

During the Watergate scandals, Sullivan's name surfaced on some of the White House tapes.

Then-President Richard Nixon and aides discussed obtaining information from Sullivan about political surveillance ordered by Johnson and Kennedy. Whatever information Sullivan provided apparently fell short of their expectations.

In recent years, Sullivan had been named in several civil suits brought by persons who claimed they were the objects of illegal FBI surveillance.

Fort Worth Star - Telegram

November 10, 1977

* * * * * * * * * * *

EXCLUSIVE! EXCLUSIVE! FOR SALE: ZAPRUDER SLIDE SETS!!!

For the past few months, we've been offering for sale the only complete sets of full frame 35mm color slides of the Zapruder film. These sets are of amazingly clear quality.

We offer these sets at just above production cost for the most serious of researchers at $1.00 per slide.

The sets consist of 500 slides:

A/ the 354 frames in which President Kennedy and Governor Connally appear. These are in full color and are full frame from a first generation negative made from the original Zapruder film.

B/ the four "missing" frames between frames 207 and 212 including frame #210, the first frame in which the President could have been hit by a shot from the easternmost window of the sixth floor of the Texas School Book Depository. These are in black and white.

C/ the most important 146 frames of the President in extreme close-up and in color.

There will be only 20 such sets produced.

We have, however, received a great many requests for sets at a lower cost. We will not compromise quality.

We originally did not want to offer condensed sets because of the importance of the complete ones. We are now changing our policy.

We will now offer two condensed sets of these incredible transparencies.

The first condensed set will consist of 100 slides.
a- Frames 185-244. The entire non-fatal shot sequence.
b- Frames 310-349. The entire head shot sequence.
c- Frames 412-414. The mysterious possible assassin.
d- Frames 454 showing the stockade fence on the grassy knoll.

The second condensed set will consist of 40 slides.
a- Frames 185-189. The neck shot.
b- Frames 223-244. Road sign, back shot, and Connally hit.
c- Frames 312-321. The head shots.

The set of 100 will be priced at a production cost of $201.00.

The set of 40 will be priced at $151.00.

The 500 slide sets require a 50% deposit to secure a subscription. The balance is due when the sets are ready for shipping. (we will notify you my mail) In the event that the 20 sets are not subscribed, deposits will be refunded.

The 40 and 100 slide sets require payment with the orders. This limited offer may be withdrawn by the producer at any time. All orders will be filled in approximately 30 days.

SECRET SERVICE REPORT 491 by Patricia Lambert

(Continued from the October Issue)

In arriving at its conclusions the Warren Commission relied on two pieces of evidence: (1) the Dallas Police photographs of the sixth floor taken by R.L. Studebaker which show no sack, no bones and no bottle at the sniper's nest but do show a sack and a bottle on the floor at the third set of double windows; and (2) the testimony of Bonnie Ray Williams who claimed he left the sack and bottle on the floor as shown in the Studebaker picture.

The Studebaker Picture

Det. Studebaker testified before the Warren Commission that he took the picture of the chicken lunch "before anything was touched and before it was dusted." The picture shows a Dr. Pepper bottle and a lunch sack on the floor near a two-wheel cart in front of the third set of windows. (17H507) There are no chicken bones visible in this picture nor in any other picture taken that day. Studebaker explained why. The chicken bones, he told the Commission:

> "were all inside the sack, wrapped up and put right back in." (7H146)

By the time Studebaker took this picture, the chicken bones seen at the sniper's nest by Dep. Sheriff Mooney and Police Officers Brewer, Hill and Montgomery were no longer visible because they were "inside the sack." Also the sack and bones were no longer atop a box in the southeast corner but now were on the floor in front of the third set of windows. Studebaker may have taken this picture "before (anything) was dusted" but he certainly did not take it "before anything was touched."

The fact is, no one who saw the chicken lunch that day saw what Studebaker photographed. In addition to the six men who saw the lunch at the sniper's nest, other witnesses arrived on the sixth floor later that afternoon. These later witnesses saw the chicken lunch at various locations but none of them saw the sack and bottle as photographed. Like Mooney and the others, these men also saw the chicken bones. But unlike the first group of witnesses, each of these men saw the lunch at a different place. Officer Marvin Johnson saw the sack, "remnants of fried chicken" and the bottle at the second set of double windows; Detective E. L. Boyd saw "some chicken bones" and a "lunch sack" on "top of some boxes" at the third set of windows; and FBI agents Nat Pinkston and J. Doyle Williams accompanied by an employee of the Depository, William Shelley, viewed the scene after the sack and bottle were removed from the building, and saw the bones along with some wax paper on the floor near the center (i.e., third) window.[17*]

The wide variety of these later sightings and their chronology (this is, the fact that they all occurred after the initial group saw the lunch at the sniper's nest) suggest that the lunch was removed from its original position and moved about on the sixth floor before it was finally placed on the floor in front of the third set of double windows where it was photographed.

---

* Shelley's testimony to the Warren Commission about the lunch remnants differs from the FBI version, but since the FBI report was written the day of the sighting and Shelley's testimony was not given until April, the FBI report is the most reliable recollection of what was seen.

Clearly, the Studebaker picture, supposedly taken before anything was touched on the sixth floor, suffers from a severe credibility problem. During his Warren Commission interview, Studebaker was asked if he saw any chicken bones at the sniper's nest and he replied that he did not recall any and if there had been, "It ought to be in one of these pictures..." (7H147) There Studebaker defined the problem.

Not only did the deputies and officers who saw the lunch on November 22 fail to provide testimony that supported the picture, but the two of them who saw the picture unequivocally rejected it. When Dep. Sheriff Mooney and Officer Montgomery were shown the Studebaker picture both of them told the Warren Commission that they did not remember the scene it depicted. And Montgomery, after looking at the picture, continued to insist that there were chicken bones "over here around where the hulls were found...I know there was one piece laying up on top of the box there." (7H93)

Lt. J. C. Day, who also took photographs of the sixth floor that afternoon, arrived on the scene with Studebaker and was his immediate superior. Day is the only one of these later witnesses who provided any support for Studebaker's picture. He is the only one of this group, except Studebaker, who did not see the chicken bones outside the sack. Also, he recalled seeing the lunch sack and pop bottle at the third set of windows. However, when he was shown the picture, he was unable to locate the sack and commented that it didn't show in the picture. (4H266) He then stated that he didn't remember where the sack was located.

Day's failure to see the sack in the picture is understandable. As shown, the sack is practically hidden from sight. It is on the floor at the east end of a two-wheel cart between the cart and a stack of boxes. A sack in that position would have been difficult to spot on November 22. Certainly no sack in that location could have been confused with one on top of a box in the southeast corner, 20 or 30 feet to the east.

If the chicken bones were <u>inside</u> the sack as Studebaker claims, and as his picture indicates, none of the people on the sixth floor that day would have seen them. But six of them did, three from the first group at the scene and three who arrived later.[18] The only explanation for this contradiction is that the bones were outside initially and were put inside the sack before the picture was taken. Since the bones were obviously moved from outside the sack to inside, it is hardly unreasonable to suggest that the entire lunch was then moved from one location to another, from the sniper's nest to the third set of double windows before being photographed.

The question that remains is why this was done. A police affidavit contained in the 26 volumes of Commission Hearings and Exhibits provides the motive. Sometime on November 22, Wesley Frazier, the man who drove Oswald to work that Friday morning, signed a sworn statement which included the following information:

> "Lee (Oswald) did not carry his lunch today. He told me this morning he was going to buy his lunch today." (24H209)

This statment, made the day of the assassination, established that the remnants of a chicken lunch found at the sniper's nest were not Oswald's. This meant someone else ate his lunch there and the bones, sack and bottle were evidence of that fact. Once it was known that Oswald did not bring his lunch to work that day, the chicken lunch became an impediment to the theory that Oswald, acting alone, fired the fatal shots from the southeast corner window of the sixth floor. Consequently, the chicken bones, lunch sack and Dr. Pepper bottle were moved away from the alleged sniper's nest in order to disassociate them from the gunman.

<u>The Chicken "Sandwich"</u>

Two weeks after the assassination, the Secret Service found a witness to

support the Studebaker picture. Bonnie Ray Williams was interviewed on November 23 by the FBI, but not until he was interviewed by the Secret Service in December did he lay claim to the chicken lunch found on the sixth floor.

The day after the assassination, Williams was interviewed by the FBI and gave a detailed account of his movements on November 22:

> "At approximately 12 noon, Williams went back upstairs...to the 6th floor with his lunch. He stayed on that floor only about three minutes, and seeing no one there, descended to the fifth floor..." (CD5,p330)

Here Williams described a brief three-minute trip to the sixth floor. There is no suggestion in this FBI report (1) that he ate his lunch on the sixth floor; (2) that his lunch contained chicken bones; or (3) that he left anything behind on the sixth floor. Williams' entire chicken bone story materialized in December when he was interviewed by the Secret Service.

Secret Service report 491 summarizes Williams' statement in part as follows:

> "After Williams picked up his lunch on the first floor he returned to the sixth floor and sat near the windows in the center of the building overlooking Elm Street and ate his lunch. Included in his lunch was a chicken sandwich and Williams claims that there were some chicken bones in the sandwich and he left them on the floor at the time he ate. He also left an empty Dr. Pepper bottle at the same location. He drank the Dr. Pepper with his lunch.
>
> "Williams...went to the fifth floor...prior to 12:15 P.M. (CD87)

Williams' three-minute trip to the sixth floor, which he described to the FBI the day after the assassination, expanded here to 15 minutes during which he ate his curious "chicken sandwich" and left the bones behind.

Williams' Secret Service story is not only late-blooming but, like Norman's, it conflicts with his earlier statement to the FBI. This December testimony is the final solution to the problem posed by the chicken bones. It is an important solution, however, one that fails to explain the most credible evidence, the testimony of those who saw the chicken bones at the sniper's nest. On the contrary, it is a story that corroborates the Studebaker picture, the only testimony to do so, and that alone is cause for skepticism.

Three months later, when Williams testifeid before the Warren Commission he improved his story somewhat. He included the two-wheel cart (shown in the Studebaker picture), claiming he sat on it while eating his "sandwich". And he added a sack, saying he put the bones back inside before he "threw the sack down."

To his credit, Williams' reluctance to associate himself with the chicken bones is apparent in his refusal to call his lunch "fried chicken." He repeatedly referred to it as a "chicken sandwich". This "sandwich" prompted the following exchange between Williams and Commission attorney Ball:

WILLIAMS: I had a chicken sandwich.

BALL: Describe the sandwich. What did it have in it besides chicken?

WILLIAMS: Well, it just had chicken in it. Chicken on the bone.

BALL: Chicken on the bone?

WILLIAMS: Yes.

BALL: The chicken was not boned?

WILLIAMS: It was just chicken on the bone. Just plain old chicken.

BALL: Did it have bread around it?

WILLIAMS: Yes it did. (3H169)

Understandably, Ball had difficulty visualizing a chicken sandwich with bones in it. That was Williams story, however, and Ball resolved the problem by suggesting that Williams' "chicken on the bone" had bread around it. This conjured up a stange culinary image but it permitted Williams to have his "sandwich" and the Commission to have an explantion for the bones found on the sixth floor.

There is no doubt about the function of Williams' testimony. As first outlined in the December report, the message imparted was clear: the bones found on the sixth floor which received so much early publicity were not found at the sniper's nest as first reported but at a totally different window, well removed from the southeast corner, and they were not left there by the assassin but by Bonnie Ray Williams.

This story, secured by the Secret Service ten days after the assassination and passed on to the staff of the Warren Commission determined the course of the inquiry regarding the chicken lunch. By provding this innocent explanation early in the investigation, the Secret Service precluded the exploration of other possibilities which might have yielded quite a different story. Certainly if someone other than Oswald ate his lunch at the sniper's nest and that person was there when the shots were fired or shortly before, that information would have had an impact on the Commission's investigation. There is evidence that such a person was seen at the sniper's nest.

A witness outside the building, Arnold Rowland, testified that he saw an elderly Negro at the window of the sniper's nest five or six minutes before the shooting.[19] In addition, there is evidence that another witness, Amos Euins, moments after the shooting, said the man at the sniper's nest was black. (6H170) (Euins later said he could not say whether the man was black or white. 2H207) The Warren Report explains that while Rowland was not regarded as a credible witness, his assertion about the elderly Negro at the sniper's nest was investigated. This investigation consisted of interviews with certain employees of the Depository which determined that the only two men who might fit Rowland's description were on the first floor "before and during the assassination." (WRp252)

A more vigorous inquiry might have been conducted if the Commission, in addition to investigating Rowland's claim, had been actively seeking an explanation for the presence of chicken bones found at the sniper's nest. The chicken lunch would have given Rowland's allegation more substance and additional steps might have been taken. For instance, the Commission could have made an effort for Rowland to identify the Negro he saw from among the employees of the building. Also, fingerprints on both the lunch sack and the bottle could have been checked against those of the employees. Since the chicken lunch was dismissed early in the Commission's investigation, it was not associated with Rowland's testimony and only a superficial effort was made to identify the man Rowland claimed he saw at the sniper's nest only minutes before the shooting.

The Warren Commission's attitude toward the lunch remnants was determined early in December when the Commission's inquiry was just beginning. The testimony in SS491 indicated to the Commission staff that the lunch was totally unrelated to both the sniper's nest and to the assassin. This position is challenged by the testimony of the Deputy Sheriff who found the shells and four other law enforcement officers present on the sixth floor at the time, as well as by the

testimony of the officer who guarded the sniper's nest. Unfortunately, these men all testified late in the investigation, long after the Secret Service interview with Williams had steered the Commission's inquiry away from the chicken lunch.

CHARLES GIVENS--Oswald at the Crime Scene

The Warren Report introduces the testimony of Charles Givens as follows:

> "Additional testimony linking Oswald with the point from which the shots were fired was provided by the testimony of Charles Givens, who was the last known employee to see Oswald inside the building prior to the assassination." (WRp143)

This statement shows the importance which the Commission attributed to the testimony of this witness. Givens was regarded by the Commission as the last person "to see Oswald" before the assassination. According to Givens' statement to the Commission in April, he last saw Oswald on the sixth floor in the vicinity of the sniper's nest 35 minutes before the shooting. As in the case of Harold Norman and Bonnie Ray Williams, the history of Given's testimony suggests a story quite different from that quoted in the Warren Report.

The problems with Givens' testimony are so formidable it is embarrassing to find it quoted in the Commission's Report. Two facts from the checkered history of this story are particularly relevant to the present discussion:

(1) On November 22, Givens told the FBI he last saw Oswald at about 11:50 in the domino room on the first floor of the building. (CD5p329)

(2) Two weeks later Givens' story changed, the domino room sighting was eliminated and Givens told the Secret Service he last saw Oswald on the sixth floor. (CD87)

FBI Interview 11/22/63

The day of the assassination, Givens told the FBI he saw Oswald three times that morning:

(1) "working on the fifth floor during the morning filling orders."

(2) "standing by the elevator in the building at 11:50 AM when Givens went to the first floor."

(3) "reading a newspaper in the domino room where the employees eat lunch about 11:50 A.M." (CD5p329)

This original version of when and where Givens saw Oswald that day is totally different from his later statement to the Secret Service. In this first account given to the FBI on November 22, Givens last saw Oswald on the first floor in the room where the employees, including Oswald, normally ate lunch. At that time, roughly 40 minutes before he allegedly committed the crime of the century, Oswald was behaving quite normally, doing what he did at lunchtime: reading a newspaper.

To some extent, this testimony by Givens corroborates Oswald's own statement made that afternoon after his arrest. During his interrogation at Police headquarters, Oswald claimed he was on the first floor when the President's motorcade passed the building. Two FBI agents heard Oswald make this statement:

> "Oswald stated that he went to lunch at approximately noon

> and he claimed he ate his lunch on the first floor in the lunchroom...Oswald claimed to be on the first floor when President John F. Kennedy passed this building." (17H786)

Oswald claimed he was in the first floor lunchroom "at approximately noon." Givens' statement to the FBI placed him there at 11:50, indicating that Oswald was telling the truth about his whereabouts at that time. Oswald also claimed he was still on the first floor when the motorcade passed the building, but it does make Oswald's assertion plausible. Givens' November 22 statement lent credibility to Oswald's alibi and this presented a problem for those intent on establishing Oswald's guilt. This problem was solved two weeks later when Givens withdrew his original testimony and converted to a witness for the prosecution.

Secret Service Interview (SS491)

Sometime between December 2 and 5, 1963, Givens was interviewed by the Secret Service, and according to SS491:

> "Givens stated that he saw Oswald on the sixth floor at about 11:45 A.M...and that Oswald was carrying a clipboard that appeared to have some orders on it. Givens felt that Oswald was looking for some books to fill an order, which is his job, and did not give the matter further thought. Shortly thereafter, Givens and the other employees working on the floor-laying project quit for lunch and they took both elevators. They were racing the elevators to the first floor and Givens heard Oswald call to them to send one of the elevators back up..." (CD87)

This account describes only one sighting of Oswald and it took place on the sixth floor at about 11:45. At this point, the picture of Oswald last seen reading a newspaper in the domino room is replaced by a totally new image. Now he is last seen on the sixth floor. The purpose of this new version is obvious: to incriminate Oswald.

The Clipboard

A new and important item was added to Givens' story during this December interview - Oswald's clipboard. SS491 contains the first mention of the clipbaord Oswald was supposedly carrying when last seen on the sixth floor: "Oswald was carrying a clipboard that appeared to have some orders on it," the report states. The Warren Report explains the important of this item:

> "The significance of Givens' observation that Oswald was carrying his clipboard became apparent on December 2, 1963, when an employee, Frankie Kaiser, found a clipbaord hidden by book cartons in the northwest corner of the sixth floor at the west wall a few feet from where the rifle had been found... Kaiser identified it as the clipboard which Oswald had appropriated from him when Oswald came to work at the Depository..." (WRp143)

This narrative outlines the following sequence of events: once alone on the sixth floor, Oswald hid the clipbaord near the spot where he later concealed his rifle; it went undetected for ten days; on or about December 2 Givens made his statement to the Secret Service but the "significance" of his reference to the clipboard was not apparent until the clipboard was found by Kaiser on December 2.

This interpretation raises numerous questions. First, why would Oswald bother to hide his clipboard? And if he did, why wasn't it found during the search of the sixth floor on November 22? According to Kaiser's description of its lo-

cation, the clipboard wasn't hidden at all, merely lying on the floor between some cartons and the wall. How then did it go unnoticed for ten days?

The major question, however, relates to the timing of the clipboard's discovery and Givens' testimony about it. The Warren Report implies that Givens' reference to the clipboard occurred prior to the clipbaord's discovery but, in fact, both arrived on the scene with the juxtaposition of Siamese twins. Givens' statement to the Secret Service occurred between December 2 and December 5, which means his reference to the clipbaord was made the same day it was "found" or within three days afterwards. The true implication of this tardy, simultaneous appearance is ominous and far-reaching. It means that whoever was reshaping the testimony of witnesses also had access to certain items of physical evidence.

The clipboard and Givens' Secret Service testimony are virtually inseparable. They appeared at the same time, each supported the other, and together they provided the Warren Commission with evidence "linking Oswald with the point from which the shots were fired." Yet in the first statement that Givens made on November 22 he stated that he last saw Oswald on the first floor, not the sixth, and that Oswald was reading a newspaper, not carrying a clipboard.

Only one version can be true, Oswald was either one place or the other and the earliest, most reliable evidence places him in the lunch room. There is no reason to doubt Givens' first statement to the FBI but there is abundant reason to doubt his later statement to the Secret Service. Givens had no motive to fabricate the first version. It served no purpose and and helped no one, except Oswald, a fact Givens could not have known when he gave the statement on November 22. On the other hand, the later story served a valuable function. Coupled with the physical evidence provided by the clipboard, it contributed to the web of circumstantial evidence used to incriminate Oswald. Moreover, it effectively eliminated Givens' earlier testimony which had raised the disquieting possibility that Oswald's statements about his whereabouts during the assassination might be true.

SS491---What does it mean?

In evaluating the significance of this document, it is useful to consider how different the record would be if the original statements made by Harold Norman, Bonnie Ray Williams and Charles Givens to the FBI had prevailed. There would be no audio evidence, raising the question of why the men below the sniper's nest heard nothing overhead during the assassination. There would be no explanation for the remnants of a chicken lunch found on the sixth floor, necessitating further investigation in that area. And there would be no testimony placing Oswald on the sixth floor after everyone else went to lunch, instead there would be support for Oswald's claim that he was on the first floor when the shots were fired. (It should be noted that the FBI reports detailing the initial statements of these three men were not published in the Commission's 26 volumes but, instead, were placed in the Archives.)

This report by the Secret Service suggests a certain pattern of activity. It is extremely unlikely that these three stories blossomed independently of each other and appeared for the first time in the same document either by accident or coincidence. On the contrary, a systematically coordinated effort appears to be operating. One designed to steer the Warren Commission's inquiry in a particular direction during its early stages and to prevent the Commission from pursuing certain areas where investigation might have yielded conclusions different from those finally reached. (It is possible, in fact likely, that similar efforts took place in other, more critical, areas.) When viewed in this way, SS491 could be interpreted as circumstantial evidence implicating the Secret Service in an orchestrated effort to conceal the truth about the assassination.

On the other hand, it could be argued that the Secret Service was merely

an unwitting conduit for the new information supplied by these three witnesses. That possibility prompts a number of questions:

--Who decided it was necessary to reinterview the employees of the TSBD en masse?

--Why was the Secret Service chosen to do the job, instead of the FBI?

--And what bureaucratic process was involved in these decisions; who set the process into motion; and why?

--Were these interviews really necessary, or were they only set up to allow Harold Norman, Bonnie Ray Williams and Charles Givens to revise their earlier testimony, and to put their new stories into the record?

The obvious implication of this line of thinking is that someone involved in manipulating the testimony of these three men was in a position to influence the actual mechanics of the Warren Commission's field investigation.

In the final analysis, the ultimate dimensions of SS491 cannot be adequately defined at this point--more information is needed. But what we know is grim enough: eyewitness testimony was falsified and physical evidence manipulated. Regardless of the role played by the Secret Service, whether that agency was the source of the revised testimony or merely a conduit for it, the implications are unpleasant in the extreme. For such a complex and calculated effort could not have succeeded without high level assistance from within the investigation itself.

17. 7H102, 103 (Johnson); 7H121, 122 (Boyd); 6H330 (Shelley); CD5, p371 (FBI agents); CD1245p84 (Studebaker).
18. 3H288 (Mooney); 7H46 (Hill); 6H307 (Brewer); 7H97, 98 (Montgomery); 7H102 (Johnson); 7H121 (Boyd).
19. 2H175, 178, 188 (Rowland).

* * * * * * * * * * * *

PARALLELS BETWEEN "OPERATION ANTHROPOID" AND THE JFK ASSASSINATION

By Ian MacFarlane

It was shortly after 10:30 in the morning. The Czechoslovakian capital, Prague, basked in the brilliance of the spring sun. Lilacs bloomed in the gardens of suburban houses, their scent wafting throughout the city.

A big Mercedes - an open sports model - slowed to take a sharp right hand bend. It was the only bend the car would have to take during its entire journey.

A young man leaning against a tree combed his hair. In his hand was a pocket mirror. The mirror flashed brightly...

The Mercedes turned into the bend, just as it did every day. But today it was not accompanied by escorts. The speed slackened to 12 miles an hour. The driver noticed several motionless young men standing on the right hand side of the road.

Suddenly, one of the young men broke away from the group and ran into the path of the limousine. Braking hard, the driver cursed - first in anger, then in

fright. The young man had drawn a light sub-machinegun from beneath his raincoat. He pulled the trigger.

Nothing happened. The gun was jammed. The eminent occupant of the car, seated beside the driver, reached for his pistol. Fractions of seconds passed. The driver thought of running the man down. The occupant stood up, shouted to the driver, and sat down again...

At the side of the road, another assassin drew his pistol. A third grabbed a grenade from his briefcase, and lobbed it high in the air. The Mercedes accelerated - but too late - the bomb landed in the back of the car, exploding on impact.

"There was a terrible bang," a woman eyewitness said later. "There was a great deal of smoke all around me and there was dust and sweepings in my eyes; only it wasn't dust or sweepings, but the stuffing of car seats...

"(The driver) jumped out of the car and began firing at the men and then there was another German (the occupant) holding his back and trying to fire too, but he was staggering about and couldn't manage it," she recalled.

The occupant of the car - Acting Reichsprotektor Reinhard Heydrich, founder of the Gestapo, deputy to Himmler, and known to the Czechs as "The butcher of Prague" - was mortally wounded. The date was May 27, 1942. Heydrich died on June 4 of septicaemia. The wound in his back had been only three inches deep, ye in the end it killed the man who had promised Hitler he would "Germanize this Czech rabble."

Separated by 21 years, there are some remarkable similarities between Heydrich's death and the assassination of John F. Kennedy. They bear thinking about Consider these comparisons:

The Route: The site for Heydrich's assassination was the only sharp bend in his route that day. The car was forced to slow down to 12 mph. V Holesvich Street was in a densely populated area. There would be panic, the assassins had predicted, traffic would halt and, in the ensuing turmoil, the assassins would be able to escape.

In Dallas, in November 1963, President Kennedy died amidst gunfire just after his limousine had negotiated the only sharp bend in the entire Dallas motorcade route. The Presidential vehicle was travelling at less than 11 mph when the bullets struck. There were many people present, the location being in the city of Dallas itself - and there was panic, traffic jams...and the assassins did escape.

Signals and Communication: A mirror flashed a signal to the men awaiting the arrival of Heydrich's car. Thus alerted, they moved into position. The mirror also distracted the attention of Heydrich's driver.

In Dealey Plaza, Dallas, a man had an "epileptic fit" prior to the arrival of the motorcade. The "fit" drew the attention of the crowd (although several spectators nonetheless saw two men in the Texas School Book Depository at a sixth floor window, one armed with a rifle). An "umbrella man" standing in Elm street at the exact site of the killing is widely held to have been a "visual co-ordinator" for the assassins. Never identified, the man's strange behavior before and after the assassination is strongly suspicious. According to a confession,* a radio communications system was installed at the Adolphus Hotel in Main Street - through which the motorcade had just passed.

The Assassins: Heydrich's assassins were exiled Czechs, who had parachuted back into their country (after a 1000 mile flight from London). The two man "team", known as "Anthropoid", had been extensively trained and equipped. Their

task was solely Heydrich's assassination, and they ultimately enlisted the aid of Czech Resistance movement in their venture. Many plans were discounted as the assassin team monitored Heydrich's movements. The assassination site was chosen with care. With the help of Czech informants close to the German administration, the assassins discovered that on the afternoon of May 27, Heydrich planned to fly to Berlin for a top level conference with Hitler. It was a trip never made.

Kennedy's assassins have still not yet been brought to book. Thanks to a bumbling, bungled investigation (and a sycophantic media) we are still "officially" in the dark about the actual identities of the killers. (We can, however, forget with ease the new-fangled "Cuban Connection.")

German authorities and police in Prague in 1942 were unfettered by "lone-assassin" syndrones. They knew, in great detail, the exact positions of the assassins and the circumstances of Heydrich's killing within hours of the event. They faced reality, they acknowledged conspiracy - they caught the killers quickly, killing them in a shoot-out in a church, a few days after the assassination.

The Dallas Police, the FBI and the Secret Service (and all the King's men, one could well add!) couldn't put the jig-saw they made for themselves back together again. Afflicted with a moronic and touching devotion to the theory that only sick people (always acting alone) kill American dignitaries, they managed to assemble the most comical and pathetic "solution" to a murder ever contrived. Eyewitnesses (who saw more than one gunman, heard gunfire from locations other than the Texas School Book Depository, or who heard more than the allowable three shots) were stonily ignored at every level of the investigation. The physical evidence was overlooked when convenient, and the facts about the assassination were altered to fit the pet theories of Warren Commissioners and their staff. Hell (and how I hate to say this), even the Nazis could have done a better job!

The Killing: Heydrich's assassination was cool, professional and meticulously planned. So was Kennedy's. The assassins of Heydrich discounted several plans before choosing the final site. So did Kennedy's (Chicago, Miami?). Heydrich faced a triumvirate of weapons (sten-gun, pistol and poisoned grenades), Kennedy fell in a triangel of gunfire (the gunmen being equipped with weapons - except for the apocryphal "Mannlicher-Carcano" rifle - 21 years more advanced and deadly."

Decoys: Members of the Czech Resistance were stationed strategically around the area of Heydrich's ambush. At the first sign of police activity, they were to quickly move in and engage the policemen in conversation, ask directions or otherwise divert their attention. Their job was to aid the escape of the assassins.

* By Jim Hicks in New Orleans, during the "Garrison Inquiry."

(To be continued in the December Issue)

* * * * * * * * * * * *

HENRY WADE AND DALLAS JUSTICE

By Larry R. Harris

"The Trial of Lee Harvey Oswald", aired recently on ABC-TV, reminded us that had the accused assassin lived to stand trial, the prosecutor (barring a change of venue) would not have been a shrewd, hardnosed Ben Gazarra-type. Rather, the prosecution would have been led by Henry Wade, the drawling, tobacco-chewing District Attorney of Dallas. Wade, a former FBI agent, has held the D.A. post since January 1, 1951; there are no signs that he plans to relinquish the job any time in the near future.

Retired Dallas Police chief Jesse Curry admitted in 1969 that had Oswald been brought to trial, conviction would have been difficult if not impossible because of insufficient evidence. District Attorney Wade disagrees with that contention, presumably, for he believes that any case, no matter how weak-- and the case against Oswald was ridiculously weak-- can be won with the "right" jury. What, to Wade's arch-conservative way of thinking, constitutes the "right" jury? What follows is exerpted from D Magazine (June, 1977); it gives us an idea of how Wade assembles the "right" jury. It is, in our opinion, an astonishing commentary on justice in Dallas.

How Henry Wade Selects a Jury

"Any case, no matter how weak," Henry Wade says, "can be won with the right jury." Wade's phenomenally high number of convictions in cases brought to trial probably supports his argument. In the preliminary examinations of prospective jurors, known to lawyers as voir dire, Wade and his men weed out "undesirables." "I look for tough chins," Wade says. He also looks for men or women of German descent, preferably Lutherans or Presbyterians, aged 35 to 55. The very old, he theorizes, are likely to be soft when it comes to putting someone to death; the very young, he thinks, don't have fixed convictions. He eliminates the Irish because they're soft-hearted and the overweight because they lack discipline.

Some prospective jurors, of course, are full of surprises. Once, Wade recalls, he had determined to strike a venireman he thought was too old. But during questioning, Wade asked if he could vote to sentence a man to electrocution for his crime. The man looked at Wade with fiery eyes: "Mr. Wade, it's not only right, the Bible teaches it!" Wade, suppressing a smile, returned to the prosecutor's table. His young assistant leaned over and asked, "You're not going to take that guy, are you? He must be 70 if he's a day." "You bet I am," Wade whispered back. "You wait, he'll be our strongest juror."

That turned out to be an understatement. When the judge asked the jury to retire and deliberate, the man stood up and shouted to the courtroom: "I know how I'm going to vote. Why can't we just do it right here?"

What Wade and his men look for is spelled out by one of his chief prosecutors, Jon Sparling, in the office's prosecutor's manual — a thick and often brutally frank volume. The section on jury selection is reprinted below.

"What to look for in a juror."

A. Attitudes.

1. You are not looking for a fair juror, but rather a strong, biased and sometimes hypocritical individual who believes that Defendants are different from them in kind, rather than degree.
2. You are not looking for any member of a minority group which may subject him to oppression — they almost always empathize with the accused.
3. You are not looking for the free thinkers and flower children.

B. Observation is worthwhile.

1. Look at the panel out in the hall before they are seated. You can spot the showoffs and the liberals by how and to whom they are talking.
2. Observe the veniremen as they walk into the courtroom.
   a. You can tell almost as much about a man by how he walks, as how he talks.
   b. Look for physical afflictions. These people usually sympathize with the accused.
3. Dress.
   a. Conservatively, well dressed people are generally stable and good for the State.
   b. In many counties, the jury summons states that the appropriate dress is coat and tie. One who does not wear a coat and tie is often a non-conformist and therefore a bad State's juror.
4. Women.
   a. I don't like women jurors because I can't trust them.
   b. They do, however, make the best jurors in cases involving crimes against children.
   c. It is possible that their "women's intuition" can help you if you can't win your case with the facts.
   d. Young women too often sympathize with the Defendant; old women wearing too much make-up are usually unstable, and therefore are bad State's jurors.
   e. It is impossible to keep women off your jury, but try to keep the ratio at least seven to five in favor of men.
5. Weight. Extremely overweight people, especially women and young men, indicates a lack of self-discipline and often times instability. I like the lean and hungry look.
6. Age. People over forty are more settled and more ready to believe that criminals should be punished.
7. Race. Minority races almost always empathize with the Defendant.
8. Demeanor.
   a. Attentive, intelligent looking veniremen that you are able to communicate with on Voir Dire will generally be all right.
   b. Always observe how the veniremen react when being questioned by the defense attorney, and compare it to the venireman's reaction to you.

The D Magazine article fails to mention it, but it should be added that Wade has a separate jury wheel containing the names of prospective jurors for capital offense cases. Persons whose names appear on this special wheel have proven themselves in the past to be Henry Wade's prototype of the "right" (as in "right-wing") juror.

Presumably, with the "right" jury and with heavy emphasis on Oswald's alleged pro-Marxist beliefs (a bigger crime than killing John Kennedy, to many in Dallas), Wade believes he would have obtained a conviction against the accused assassin ("a Goddamned communist", as Wade's notoriously-right-wing assistant Bill Alexander termed Oswald). It would have been a stacked deck, folks, and the Dealer would have been Henry Wade....

* * * * * * * * * * * * *

ASSASSINATION COMMITTEE CAN HELP !!!

By Penn Jones

If the second Assassination Committee in Washington wanted to make a positive contribution towards the solution of the assassination of President John F. Kennedy, which we doubt, they could do two things in open meeting and without calling a single witness.

FIRST: The Committee should order a massive reprinting of the Testimony and Exhibits (The 26 Volumes).

Only a few copies were printed. Only 2650 sets were sold to the public. For 250,000,000 people to read 2650 sets of books is an impossibility. It is an outrage that students have to pay $1,000.00 or more for a set of books regarding the assassination of an American President. Free government books are available for almost every insect found in the land.

SECOND: The Committee should order a reduction on the price of documents from the Archives. The current price is 20¢ per page. The FBI is being somewhat generous in reducing the cost of the 80,000 pages of FBI documents concerning the assassination of President Kennedy soon to be released. The price of these 80,000 pages is to cost 10¢ per page for this release only.

If the government were serious about the solution of this murder, the price of these documents should be immediately reduced to 2¢ per page.

Our own government continues to be the biggest enemy for those who are trying to uncover the giant conspiracy which wiped away so many of our leaders since the early sixties.

* * * * * * * * * * * * *

SUBSCRIPTION BLANK

THE CONTINUING INQUIRY, P. O. BOX 1140, Midlothian, Texas 76065

Please enter my one-year subscription to THE CONTINUING INQUIRY. My payment of $24.00 is enclosed. ($12.00 for students)

Mail to:

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____ APT. _____

CITY _____ STATE _____ ZIP CODE _____

We now have all documents which have been released by the National Archives. We will sell these documents for 15¢ per page. (Washington charges 20¢ per page) We will promise delivery within two weeks. (Washington takes from two to three months for delivery) Minimum charge for any order is $2.00. (Same as the charge made by the Archives.)

An effort is being made to gather a group to travel to the Kennedy graves in Arlington Cemetery on November 22, 1978. Consider joining us.

For a group of 40 or more, the price quoted as of this date is $229 per person which includes round trip scheduled airline, three nights in a Washington hotel, plus other goodies.

If you are interested, let us know.

FOR SALE

For the first time the Jim Towner slides are available. These four slides were taken in Dealey Plaza immediately after the shots were fired that killed President Kennedy. We consider three of these slides extremely important. Price for the four slides is $12.00 per set.

THE CONTINUING INQUIRY
Penn Jones, Editor
P. O. Box 1140
Midlothian, Texas 76065